

REMARKS

Independent claims 1 and 7 have been amended. Support for the amendments may be found at least in lines 9-32 on page 5 of the present application. Claims 3-4, 10-12, and 15-23 have been canceled. No new subject matter has been introduced. Accordingly, claims 1-2, 5-9, and 13-14 remain pending in the present application. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested of the Examiner in view of the remarks set forth herein.

In the Office Action, claims 20-23 were rejected under 35 USC §101 because the claimed invention was allegedly directed to non-statutory subject matter. Claims 20-23 have been canceled, rendering the Examiner's rejections of these claims under 35 USC §101 moot.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5, 7, 9, 11-13, 15-18, and 20-23 were rejected under 35 USC §102(b) as being allegedly anticipated by Amin. (US Patent No. 5,995,830, hereinafter referred to as Amin '830). Claims 6, 14, and 19 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Amin in view of Amin (US Patent No. 6,418,307, hereinafter referred to as Amin '307). Claim 8 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being allegedly obvious over Amin in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,584,316 to Akhteruzzaman. Claims 3-4, 10-12, and 15-23 have been canceled, rendering the Examiner's rejections of these claims moot. The Examiner's remaining rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 7 set forth, among other things, determining if the communication between said mobile devices has been dropped during a call between the mobile devices and determining which of the mobile devices has been dropped in response to determining that the communication between the mobile devices has been dropped. Independent claims 1 and 7 also set forth route the call from the mobile device that was not dropped to a voice

mail associated with the mobile device that was dropped in response to determining which of the mobile devices has been dropped.

Amin '830 describes techniques for handling a dropped wireless communication channel 118. For example, Amin '830 describes a landline telephone 102 that has an established wireless communication channel 118 to the mobile telephone 116. If the wireless communication channel 118 is dropped, and reconnection to the mobile telephone 116 is not appropriate, then the call from the telephone 102 may be routed to voice mail 108. However, Amin '830 does not describe or suggest techniques for determining if communication between two mobile devices has been dropped during a call. Accordingly, Amin '830 does not describe or suggest determining which of the mobile devices has been dropped and routing the call from the mobile device that was not dropped to a voice mail associated with the mobile device that was dropped.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is not anticipated by Amin '830 and request that the Examiner's rejections of claims 1-2, 5, 7, and 9 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) be withdrawn.

Moreover, Applicants respectfully submit that the present invention is not obvious in view of the prior art of record. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. As discussed above, Amin '830 does not describe or suggest techniques for determining if communication between two mobile devices has been dropped during a call. Amin '830 also fails to describe or suggest determining which of the mobile devices has been dropped and routing the call from the mobile device that was not dropped to a voice mail associated with the mobile device that was dropped. The Examiner alleges that Amin '307 describes providing notification messages that indicate that voice mail is available and Akhteruzzaman describes the

use of multiple mobile switching centers. However, these secondary references fail to remedy the fundamental deficiencies of Amin '830. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that the prior art of record fails to teach or suggest all the claim limitations.

Applicants further submit that the cited references fail to provide any suggestion or motivation to modify the prior art of record to arrive at the claimed invention. In particular, as discussed above, Amin '830 is only concerned with providing voice messages from a landline telephone 102 to a mobile telephone 116 when the wireless communication link 118 to the mobile telephone 116 is lost. Accordingly, Amin '830 is not concerned with determining which communication device has been dropped because Amin '830 assumes that only the wireless communication link 118 to the mobile telephone 116 can be lost. Thus, Amin provides no suggestion or motivation to modify the prior art to include determining if communication between two mobile devices has been dropped during a call and determining which of the mobile devices has been dropped.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case that the present invention is obvious over the prior art record. Applicants request that the Examiner's rejections of claims 6, 8, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) be withdrawn.

In view of the aforementioned reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that all the pending claims are allowable. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance is respectfully solicited. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (713) 934-4052 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Date: December 20, 2006

Respectfully submitted,

WILLIAMS, MORGAN & AMERSON
CUSTOMER NUMBER: 46290

10333 Richmond Dr., Suite 1100
Houston, Texas 77042
(713) 934-7000

/Mark W. Sincell/
Mark W. Sincell
Reg. No. 52,226

Agent for Applicant